Approximation algorithms for the vertex happiness*

Yao Xu[1], Peng Zhang[2], Randy Goebel[1], and Guohui Lin[1]

1 **Department of Computing Science, University of Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E8, Canada. {xu2, rgoebel, guohui}@ualberta.ca**

2 **School of Computer Science and Technology, Shandong University. Jinan, Shandong 250101, China. algzhang@sdu.edu.cn**

arXiv:1606.03185v2 [cs.DS] 11 Jan 2017

Abstract

We investigate the maximum happy vertices (MHV) problem and its complement, the minimum unhappy vertices (MUHV) problem. We first show that the MHV and MUHV problems are a special case of the supermodular and submodular multi-labeling (Sup-ML and Sub-ML) problems, respectively, by re-writing the objective functions as set functions. The convex relaxation on the Lovász extension, originally presented for the submodular multi-partitioning (Sub-MP) problem, can be extended for the Sub-ML problem, thereby proving that the Sub-ML (Sup-ML, respectively) can be approximated within a factor of $2-\frac{2}{k}$ ($\frac{2}{k}$, respectively). These general results imply that the MHV and the MUHV problems can also be approximated within $\frac{2}{k}$ and $2-\frac{2}{k}$, respectively, using the same approximation algorithms. For MHV, this $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm improves the previous best approximation ratio $\max\{\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{\Delta+1}\}$, where Δ is the maximum vertex degree of the input graph. We also show that an existing LP relaxation is the same as the concave relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sup-ML problem; we then prove an upper bound of $\frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of the LP relaxation. These suggest that the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm is the best possible based on the LP relaxation. For MUHV, we formulate a novel LP relaxation and prove that it is the same as the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem; we then show a lower bound of $2-\frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of the LP relaxation. Similarly, these suggest that the $(2-\frac{2}{k})$-approximation algorithm is the best possible based on the LP relaxation. Lastly, we prove that this $(2-\frac{2}{k})$-approximation is optimal for the MUHV problem, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture.

1998 ACM Subject Classification Dummy classification – please refer to `http://www.acm.org/about/class/ccs98-html`

Keywords and phrases Vertex happiness, multi-labeling; submodular set function; approximation algorithm; integrality gap

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

In a recently studied vertex-coloring problem by Zhang and Li [24], one is given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with a non-negative weight $w(v)$ for each vertex $v \in V$, a color set $C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, and a partial vertex coloring function $c : V \mapsto C$, and the goal is to color all the uncolored vertices such that the total weight of *happy* vertices is maximized. A vertex is *happy* if it shares the same color with all its neighbors in the coloring scheme. The problem is referred to as the *maximum happy vertices* (MHV) [24], which was inspired by the study

* This work was partially supported by NSERC Canada and NSFC 61672323.

© Yao Xu, Peng Zhang, Randy Goebel and Guohui Lin;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY
Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

on the *homophyly* governing the structures of large scale networks such as social networks and citation networks.

The complement of the MHV problem is the *minimum unhappy vertices* (MUHV), which can be defined analogously to minimize the total weight of unhappy vertices, where a vertex is *unhappy* if its color is different from at least one of its neighbors.

We remark that these two vertex-coloring problems are in fact labeling problems, and we use "color" and "label" interchangeably in the sequel; they are different from the classic *graph coloring* problem [12], in which a feasible vertex coloring scheme must assign different colors to any adjacent vertices. We also note that, if no vertex is pre-colored i, for any i, then this color i can be removed without affecting the optimum; we therefore assume without loss of generality that every color is used in the given partial vertex coloring function c.

Given the graph $G = (V, E)$ with the vertex set V and the edge set E, for any subset $X \subseteq V$, define the *boundary* of X, denoted as $\partial(X)$, to be the subset of vertices of X each has at least one neighbor outside of X. Let $\iota(X) = X - \partial(X)$, which is called the *interior* of X. In a vertex coloring scheme, let S_i denote the subset of all the vertices colored i; then every vertex of $\partial(S_i)$ is unhappy while all vertices of $\iota(S_i)$ are happy. We extend the vertex weight function to subsets of vertices, that is, $w(X) := \sum_{v \in X} w(v)$ for any $X \subseteq V$; and we define the set function $f(\cdot)$ as

$$f(X) := w(\partial(X)),\ \forall X \subseteq V. \tag{1}$$

Note that a vertex coloring scheme one-to-one corresponds to a partition $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k\}$ of the vertex set V, where each part S_i contains all the vertices colored i. This way, the MUHV problem can be cast as finding a partition $\mathcal{S}$ such that $f(\mathcal{S}) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} f(S_i)$ is minimized.

It is important to note that the above defined set function $f(\cdot)$ depends on the given edge set E; a change to E could alter the function definition, and subsequently alters the optimization objective. In particular, when there are multiple vertices in the graph pre-colored the same color, we cannot simply contract all of them into a single vertex unless they have exactly the same neighbors in the original graph; otherwise, this contracting process essentially changes the edge set E, causing a change to the defined set function $f(\cdot)$. (A concrete example is provided in the Appendix C.)

It is not hard to validate (the proofs are provided in the Appendix A) that the boundary $\partial(\cdot)$ of a vertex subset in the given graph $G = (V, E)$ has the following properties: i) $\partial(\emptyset) = \emptyset$; ii) $\partial(X \cap Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$; iii) $\partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$; and iv) $\partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)$, for any two subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$.

Therefore, the set function $f : 2^V \to \mathbb{R}$ defined in Eq. (1) satisfies $f(X) + f(Y) \geq f(X \cap Y) + f(X \cup Y)$, for any two subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$ (a detailed proof is provided in the Appendix B). That is, $f(\cdot)$ is a *submodular* [18] function on the set V. This way, the MUHV problem can be cast as a special case of the following submodular multi-labeling (Sub-ML) problem:

Given a ground set V, a non-negative submodular set function $f : 2^V \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(\emptyset) = 0$, a set of labels $L = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, and a partial labeling function $\ell : V \mapsto L$ which pre-assigns each label i to a non-empty subset $T_i \subset V$, the goal of the *submodular multi-labeling* (Sub-ML) problem is to find a partition $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k\}$ of the ground set V to minimize $f(\mathcal{S}) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} f(S_i)$, where the part S_i is the subset of elements assigned with the label i.

We remark again that for each i, $|T_i| \geq 1$, and any attempt to contracting T_i into a single element could either destroy the submodularity of the set function $f(\cdot)$ or alter the function definition leading to a change in the optimization objective.

Conversely, given the graph $G = (V, E)$ we define another set function $g(\cdot)$ as

$$g(X) := w(\iota(X)),\ \forall X \subseteq V. \tag{2}$$

Then $g(X) = w(X) - f(X)$ for any subset $X \subseteq V$, and consequently $g(\cdot)$ is a *supermodular* [18] function on the set V. Thus, the MHV problem can be cast as finding a partition $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k\}$ of the vertex set V such that $g(\mathcal{S}) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} g(S_i)$ is maximized, where each part S_i contains all the vertices colored i; it can also be cast as a special case of the *supermodular multi-labeling* (Sup-ML) problem that can be analogously defined.

1.1 Related research

Classification problems have been formulated as cuts, or partition, or labeling, or coloring, and have been widely studied for a very long time.

For the MHV problem, Zhang and Li [24] proved that it is polynomial time solvable for $k = 2$ and it becomes NP-hard for $k \geq 3$; for $k \geq 3$, they presented two approximation algorithms: a greedy algorithm with an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{k}$, and an $\Omega(\frac{1}{\Delta^3})$-approximation based on a subset-growth technique, where Δ is the maximum vertex degree of the input graph. Recently, Zhang *et al.* [23] presented an improved algorithm with an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$ based on a combination of randomized LP rounding techniques. Together, these imply that the current best approximation ratio for the MHV problem is $\max\{\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{\Delta+1}\}$.

For the complementary MUHV problem, to the best of our knowledge, it hasn't been particularly studied in the literature.

Recall that the MHV and the MUHV problems are a special case of the Sup-ML and the Sub-ML problems, respectively. We again remind the readers that in an instance of these multi-labeling problems, each label is pre-assigned to at least one element and to multiple elements in general. Another special case of the Sub-ML problem is when each label is pre-assigned to exactly one element, called the *submodular multiway partition* (Sub-MP) problem [25], which has received a lot of studies. In the Appendix C, we provide an instance to show that one cannot reduce the MUHV problem to the Sub-MP problem by simply contracting all elements pre-assigned the same label into a single element.

The Sub-MP problem was first studied by Zhao *et al.* [25], who presented a $(k-1)$-approximation algorithm. Years later, Chekuri and Ene [3] proposed a convex relaxation for Sub-MP by using the Lovász extension, leading to a 2-approximation. This was further improved to a $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation shortly after by Ene *et al.* [7]. On the inapproximability, Ene *et al.* [7] proved that any $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for Sub-MP requires exponentially many value queries, for any $\epsilon > 0$, or otherwise it implies $NP = RP$.

Sub-MP includes many well studied cut problems including the classic (edge-weighted) multiway cut [5], the node-weighted multiway cut [11] and the hypergraph multiway cut [19] as special cases. The multiway cut problem is NP-hard for $k \geq 3$ even if all edges have unit weight [5], with many approximation algorithms designed and analyzed [5, 2, 10, 13, 1, 20]. Most of these approximation results are based on the *linear program* (LP) relaxation presented by Călinescu *et al.* [2], and the current best approximation ratio is 1.2965 [20]. The hypergraph multiway cut and the node-weighted multiway cut are proven more difficult to approximate, that it is Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for any $\epsilon > 0$ [7].

One can similarly define the complement of the Sub-MP problem, called the *supermodular multiway partition* (Sup-MP) problem. Sup-MP includes the multiway uncut problem [15] as a special case, where the k terminals in the input graph can be considered as k elements each being pre-assigned with a distinct label. The multiway uncut problem seems only studied by Langberg *et al.* [15], who presented a 0.8535-approximation based on an LP relaxation. When

generalizing the multiway uncut problem to pre-assign multiple terminals in a part of the vertex partition, it becomes the recently studied *maximum happy edges* (MHE) problem [24]. It is important to note that MHE is not a special case of the Sup-MP problem, but a special case of the Sup-ML problem. Zhang and Li [24] presented a $\frac{1}{2}$-approximation for the MHE problem based on a simple division strategy; extending the LP relaxation for the multiway uncut, Zhang *et al.* [23] improved the approximation ratio to $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}h(k) \geq 0.8535$, where $h(k) \geq 1$ is a function in k.

More broadly, the multi-labeling problems can be deemed as special cases of the *cost allocation* (CA) problem [4], in which k different non-negative set functions are given for evaluating the k parts of the partition separately; they are also closely related to the *optimal allocation* (OA) problem [16, 17, 9, 6, 8, 14, 21] in combinatorial auctions, where no elements are necessarily pre-assigned a label but the set function (called *utility function*) is assumed monotone in general.

1.2 Our contributions

Our target problems are the MHV and the MUHV problems, and we aim to design improved approximation algorithms for them and to prove the hardness results in approximability.

We first show that the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sub-MP problem [3] can be extended for the Sub-ML problem; therefore the same approximation algorithm works for Sub-ML with a performance ratio $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$. Analogously, we present the concave relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sup-ML problem, thus proving that Sup-ML can be approximated within a factor of $\frac{2}{k}$. Therefore, the MUHV problem can be approximated within a factor of $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$ and the MHV problem can be approximated within a factor of $\frac{2}{k}$ too; the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm for the MHV problem improves the previous best ratio of $\max\{\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{\Delta+1}\}$ [24, 23].

Next, for the MHV problem, we show that the LP relaxation presented in [23], called LP-MHV, is equivalent to the concave relaxation for the Sup-ML problem based on the Lovász extension to the set function $g(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (2); for the MUHV problem, we propose a novel LP relaxation, called LP-MUHV, and we show that it is equivalent to the convex relaxation for Sub-ML based on the Lovász extension to the set function $f(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (1). We then prove an upper bound of $\frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of LP-MHV; and conclude that the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation is the best possible based on LP-MHV. We also prove a lower bound of $2 - \frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of LP-MUHV; and conclude that the $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation is the best possible based on LP-MUHV. Lastly, we prove that it is Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for MUHV, for any $\epsilon > 0$. We remark that the last hardness result gives another evidence that it is Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for the general Sub-ML problem, for any $\epsilon > 0$.

1.3 Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce some basic notions such as the Lovász extension to a set function; we then present the relaxation based on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem and a similar relaxation for the Sup-ML problem. We also present a simple approximation algorithm using the randomized rounding technique in [7], and conclude that it is a $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation for the Sub-ML problem and it is a $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation for the Sup-ML problem. In Section 3, we study the MHV problem, by firstly introducing the LP relaxation formulated in [23], then showing its equivalence to the relaxation based on the Lovász extension to the set function $f(\cdot)$ defined

in Eq. (1), and lastly proving an upper bound of $\frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap. In Section 4, we first present a novel LP relaxation for the MUHV problem, then show its equivalence to the relaxation based on the Lovász extension to the set function $g(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (2), then similarly prove a lower bound of $(2-\frac{2}{k})$ on the integrality gap, and lastly prove a stronger inapproximability result that it is Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2-\frac{2}{k}-\epsilon)$-approximation, for any $\epsilon > 0$. We conclude the paper in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Given a ground set $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$, $y_j := y(v_j)$ is a real variable that maps the element v_j to the closed unit interval $[0,1]$. For any non-negative set function $f : 2^V \to \mathbb{R}$, its Lovász extension [18, 22] is a function $\hat{f} : [0,1]^V \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (y_{\pi_j} - y_{\pi_{j+1}}) f(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\}), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in [0,1]^V$ and π is a permutation on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $1 = y_{\pi_1} \geq y_{\pi_2} \geq \ldots \geq y_{\pi_n} = 0$.

It has been proven by Lovász [18] that the set function $f(\cdot)$ is submodular (supermodular, respectively) if and only if its Lovász extension is convex (concave, respectively).

In the context of the Sub-ML problem with $f(\cdot)$ being the non-negative submodular set function and $T_i \subset V$ being the non-empty subset of elements pre-labeled i, $i \in L = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, we define a binary variable $y_j^i := y^i(v_j)$ for each pair of an element v_j and a label i, such that $y_j^i = 1$ if and only if the element v_j is labeled i. Next, y_j^i is relaxed to be a real variable in the closed unit interval $[0,1]$. For each i, let $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_1^i, y_2^i, \ldots, y_n^i) \in [0,1]^V$; let $\hat{f} : [0,1]^V \to \mathbb{R}$ be the Lovász extension of $f(\cdot)$ as defined in Eq. (3).

A relaxation based on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem can be written as follows:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}_i) \tag{CP-Sub-ML}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_j^i = 1, \quad \forall v_j \in V \tag{4}$$

$$y_j^i = 1, \quad \forall v_j \in T_i,\ i \in L \tag{5}$$

$$y_j^i \geq 0, \quad \forall v_j \in V,\ i \in L \tag{6}$$

The submodularity of the function $f(\cdot)$ implies that (CP-Sub-ML) is a *convex program* (CP) and thus can be solved in polynomial time.

In fact, such a relaxation based on the Lovász extension was proposed by Chekuri and Ene [3] for the Sub-MP problem, which is a special case of the Sub-ML problem in that $|T_i| = 1$ for every label i. We extend this relaxation for the Sub-ML problem with little change, except that in the Constraint (5) $y_j^i = 1$ holds for multiple elements v_j. Nevertheless, we remark again that one cannot reduce the Sub-ML problem to Sub-MP by cruelly contracting all the elements pre-labeled with the same label into a single element, which suggests incorrectly that all these pre-labeled elements were identical.

The following approximation algorithm RR first solves the convex program (CP-Sub-ML), followed by a randomized rounding scheme to obtain a feasible solution to the Sub-ML problem. Ene *et al.* showed that RR is a $(2-\frac{2}{k})$-approximation algorithm for the Sub-MP

problem [7]. The algorithm uses a uniformly random variable θ in the interval $(\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, and defines the following $k+3$ sets:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} S_i(\theta) & = & \{v_j \mid y_j^i > \theta\}, \text{ for each } i \in L, \\ S(\theta) & = & \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i(\theta), \\ R(\theta) & = & V - S(\theta), \\ Q(\theta) & = & R(1-\theta). \end{array} \tag{7}$$

Algorithm RR

1: Solve (CP-Sub-ML) to obtain an optimal fractional solution $\{y_j^i \mid v_j \in V, i \in L\}$.
2: Pick a parameter $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ uniformly at random.
3: Assign all elements of $S_i(\theta)$ the label i, for each $i \in L$.
4: Pick a label i' from L uniformly at random, assign all elements of $R(\theta)$ the label i'.

The performance analysis for the algorithm RR on the Sub-MP problem in [7] does not need the fact that $|T_i| = 1$ for every label i. Therefore, the same analysis proves the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 1.** [7] *Algorithm* RR *is a* $\left(2 - \frac{2}{k}\right)$*-approximation for the Sub-ML problem.*

Replacing the submodular function $f(\cdot)$ by a supermodular function $g(\cdot)$ and inverting the minimization to the maximization, a relaxation based on the Lovász extension for Sup-ML can be written as follows:

$$\text{maximize} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}_i) \tag{CP-Sup-ML}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_j^i = 1, \quad \forall v_j \in V \tag{8}$$

$$y_j^i = 1, \quad \forall v_j \in T_i,\ i \in L \tag{9}$$

$$y_j^i \geq 0, \quad \forall v_j \in V,\ i \in L \tag{10}$$

where $\hat{g} : [0,1]^V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Lovász extension of $g(\cdot)$ as defined in Eq. (3). (CP-Sup-ML) is a *concave program* and thus can be solved in polynomial time. Using an analogous argument as the proof of Theorem 1, we can have the following corollary on the Sup-ML problem.

▶ **Corollary 2.** *Algorithm* RR *is a* $\frac{2}{k}$*-approximation for the Sup-ML problem.*

3 The maximum happy vertices (MHV) problem

Recall that the MHV problem can be cast as finding a partition $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k\}$ of the vertex set V such that $g(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} g(S_i)$ is minimized, where the set function $g(\cdot)$ is defined in Eq. (2) and S_i is the subset of vertices colored i, for each i.

▶ **Lemma 3.** *The set function* $g(\cdot)$ *defined in Eq. (2) is supermodular.*

▶ **Theorem 4.** *Algorithm* RR *is a* $\frac{2}{k}$*-approximation for the MHV problem, which is a special case of the Sup-ML problem.*

The following LP relaxation for the MHV problem (LP-MHV), given a graph $G = (V, E)$, is formulated by Zhang *et al.* [23], where $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$, $w_j = w(v_j)$ denotes the weight of the vertex v_j, $C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ is the color set, $c(v_j) = i$ if the vertex v_j is pre-colored i, a binary variable $y_j^i := y^i(v_j)$ denotes whether or not the vertex v_j is colored i, and $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_1^i, y_2^i, \ldots, y_n^i)$.

$$\text{maximize} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j z_j \tag{LP-MHV}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_j^i = 1, \qquad \forall v_j \in V \tag{11}$$

$$y_j^i = 1, \qquad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall i \in C \text{ s.t. } c(v_j) = i \tag{12}$$

$$z_j^i = \min_{v_h \in N[v_j]} \{y_h^i\}, \quad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall i \in C \tag{13}$$

$$z_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} z_j^i, \qquad \forall v_j \in V \tag{14}$$

$$z_j,\ z_j^i,\ y_j^i \geq 0, \qquad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall i \in C \tag{15}$$

where z_j^i indicates whether the vertex v_j is happy by color i, z_j indicates whether the vertex v_j is happy, and $N[v_j]$ is the closed neighborhood of the vertex v_j.

For each color i, since there is at least one vertex pre-colored i and at least one vertex pre-colored another color (due to $k \geq 2$), we let π be the permutation for $\mathbf{y}_i$ such that $1 = y_{\pi_1}^i \geq y_{\pi_2}^i \geq \ldots \geq y_{\pi_n}^i = 0$. In the concave relaxation (CP-Sup-ML) based on the Lovász extension for Sup-ML, when we set the supermodular set function $g(\cdot)$ as in Eq. (2), the objective function of (CP-Sup-ML) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(y_{\pi_j}^i - y_{\pi_{j+1}}^i\right) g(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(y_{\pi_j}^i - y_{\pi_{j+1}}^i\right) \sum_{v_h \in \iota(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\})} w_h. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

For each vertex $v_p \in V$, let v_q denote its neighbor that appears the last in the permutation $(v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_n})$. Assume $p = \pi_{j_1}$ and $q = \pi_{j_2}$. Clearly, $v_p \in \iota(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\})$ if and only if $p, q \in \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_j\}$, that is, we must have $j_1, j_2 \leq j$. It follows that for the vertex $v_p \in V$, the coefficient of w_p in Eq. (16) is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=\max\{j_1, j_2\}}^{n} \left(y_{\pi_j}^i - y_{\pi_{j+1}}^i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} z_p^i = z_p,$$

where the last two equalities hold due to Constraints (13, 14) of (LP-MHV). This shows that by setting the supermodular set function $g(\cdot)$ as defined in Eq. (2), (CP-Sup-ML) is the same as (LP-MHV). Therefore, we have the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 5.** *The LP relaxation for the MHV problem (*LP-MHV*) is the same as the relaxation based on the Lovász extension for the Sup-ML problem (*CP-Sup-ML*), when the MHV problem is cast into the Sup-ML problem.*

We construct an instance $I = (G = (V, E), w(\cdot), C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}, c)$ of the MHV problem to obtain an upper bound on the integrality gap of (LP-MHV), the LP relaxation for the MHV problem.

- Let $T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k\}$ be a set of k pre-colored vertices, called *terminals*; all terminals have the same weight $w_t \geq 0$, and the terminal t_i is pre-colored i, *i.e.* $c(t_i) = i$.
- Associated with each pair of distinct terminals t_i and t_j, $i < j$, there is a vertex $b_{\{ij\}}$. Let $V_b = \{b_{\{ij\}} \mid i < j\}$, then $|V_b| = \binom{k}{2}$; all vertices of V_b have the same weight $w_b \geq 0$, and none of them is pre-colored.
- The vertex set $V = T \cup V_b$; the edge set $E = \{\{t_i, b_{\{ij\}}\}, \{t_j, b_{\{ij\}}\} \mid i < j\}$. Clearly, $|V| = k + \binom{k}{2}$ and $|E| = 2\binom{k}{2}$.

Let c^* denote a coloring function that completes the given partial coloring function c, that is, c^* assigns a color for each vertex and it assigns the color i to the terminal t_i, for each $i \in C$. Then,

- all vertices of V_b must be unhappy, since the vertex $b_{\{ij\}}$ is adjacent to two terminals t_i and t_j colored with distinct colors;
- the terminal t_i is adjacent to $k - 1$ vertices $\{b_{\{ij\}} \mid j \neq i\}$, while the vertex $b_{\{ij\}}$ is adjacent to the terminals t_i and t_j; it follows that if t_i is happy, then all vertices of $\{b_{\{ij\}} \mid j \neq i\}$ are colored i, subsequently none of the other terminals can be happy; in other words, at most one of the k terminals can be happy, regardless of what the coloring function c^* is.

Let OPT(MHV) denote the value of an optimal solution to the constructed instance I; we obtain

$$\text{OPT(MHV)} \leq w_t. \tag{17}$$

Consider the following fractional feasible solution to the instance I in the LP relaxation (LP-MHV):

- for each terminal $t_i \in T$, $y^i(t_i) = 1$ and $y^j(t_i) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$;
- for each vertex $b_{\{ij\}} \in V_b$, $y^i(b_{\{ij\}}) = y^j(b_{\{ij\}}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $y^\ell(b_{\{ij\}}) = 0$ for all $\ell \neq i, j$;
- for each terminal $t_i \in T$, we set $z^i(t_i) = y^i(b_{\{ij\}}) = \frac{1}{2}$, $z^j(t_i) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, and $z(t_i) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} z^\ell(t_i) = \frac{1}{2}$;
- for each vertex $b_{\{ij\}} \in V_b$, we set $z^\ell(b_{\{ij\}}) = 0$ for all $\ell \in C$, and $z(b_{\{ij\}}) = 0$.

Let OPT(LP-MHV) denote the optimum of the instance I in the LP relaxation (LP-MHV). It is greater than or equal to the value of the above fractional feasible solution, that is,

$$\text{OPT(LP-MHV)} \geq \frac{1}{2} k w_t. \tag{18}$$

Combining Eqs. (17) and (18), it gives an upper bound on the integrality gap of (LP-MHV):

$$\frac{\text{OPT(MHV)}}{\text{OPT(LP-MHV)}} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}k} = \frac{2}{k}.$$

We thus have proved the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 6.** *The integrality gap of (*LP-MHV*) has an upper bound of* $\frac{2}{k}$.

Theorems 4 and 6 together imply that the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm RR for the MHV problem is the best possible based on the LP relaxation (LP-MHV), and furthermore

▶ **Corollary 7.** *The $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm* RR *for the Sup-ML problem is the best possible based on the concave relaxation on the Lovász extension (*CP-Sup-ML*).*

4 The minimum unhappy vertices (MUHV) problem

Recall that the MUHV problem can be cast as finding a partition $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k\}$ of the vertex set V such that $f(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} f(S_i)$ is minimized, where the set function $f(\cdot)$ is defined in Eq. (1) and S_i is the subset of vertices colored i, for each i.

▶ **Lemma 8.** *The set function $f(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (1) is submodular.*

▶ **Theorem 9.** *Algorithm* RR *is a $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation for the MUHV problem, which is a special case of the Sub-ML problem.*

Given an instance of the MUHV problem, we use a binary variable $y_j^i := y^i(v_j)$ to denote whether or not the vertex v_j is colored i, and $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_1^i, y_2^i, \ldots, y_n^i)$. We can then formulate a novel LP relaxation as follows.

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j x_j \tag{LP-MUHV}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_j^i = 1, \qquad \forall v_j \in V \tag{19}$$

$$y_j^i = 1, \qquad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall i \in C \text{ s.t. } c(v_j) = i \tag{20}$$

$$x_j^i \geq y_j^i - y_h^i, \quad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall v_h \in N(v_j),\ \forall i \in C \tag{21}$$

$$x_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_j^i, \qquad \forall v_j \in V \tag{22}$$

$$y_j^i,\ x_j^i,\ x_j \geq 0, \qquad \forall v_j \in V,\ \forall i \in C \tag{23}$$

where x_j indicates whether the vertex v_j is unhappy, and $N(v_j)$ is the set of neighbors of v_j.

For each color i, noting there is at least one vertex pre-colored i and at least one vertex pre-colored another color (due to $k \geq 2$), we let π be the permutation on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ for $\mathbf{y}_i$ such that $1 = y_{\pi_1}^i \geq y_{\pi_2}^i \geq \ldots \geq y_{\pi_n}^i = 0$. Then by setting the submodular set function $f(\cdot)$ as defined in Eq. (1), based on the definition of the Lovász extension in Eq. (3), the objective function of the relaxation (CP-Sub-ML) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(y_{\pi_j}^i - y_{\pi_{j+1}}^i \right) f(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(y_{\pi_j}^i - y_{\pi_{j+1}}^i \right) \sum_{v_h \in \partial(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\})} w_h. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

For each vertex $v_p \in V$, let v_q denote its neighbor that appears the last in the permutation $(v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_n})$. Assume $p = \pi_{j_1}$ and $q = \pi_{j_2}$. Clearly, $v_p \in \partial(\{v_{\pi_1}, v_{\pi_2}, \ldots, v_{\pi_j}\})$ if and only if i) $p \in \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_j\}$ and ii) $q \notin \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_j\}$, that is, we must have $j_1 \leq j < j_2$.

It follows that for the vertex $v_p \in V$, the coefficient of w_p in Eq. (24) is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=j_1}^{j_2-1} \left(y^i_{\pi_j} - y^i_{\pi_{j+1}} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(y^i_p - y^i_q \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} x^i_p = x_p,$$

where the last two equalities hold due to Constraints (21, 22) of (LP-MUHV). This shows that by setting the submodular set function $f(\cdot)$ as defined in Eq. (1), (CP-Sub-ML) is the same as (LP-MUHV). Therefore, we have the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 10.** *The LP relaxation for the MUHV problem (*LP-MUHV*) is the same as the relaxation based on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem (*CP-Sub-ML*), when the MUHV problem is cast into the Sub-ML problem.*

We use the same instance $I = (G = (V, E), w(\cdot), C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}, c)$ constructed in the last section to obtain a lower bound on the integrality gap of (LP-MUHV), the LP relaxation for the MUHV problem. Let OPT(MUHV) denote the optimum of the above constructed instance I. From Eq. (17) we have

$$\text{OPT(MUHV)} \geq (k-1)w_t + \binom{k}{2} w_b. \tag{25}$$

Let us consider the following fractional feasible solution to the instance I in the LP relaxation (LP-MUHV):

- for each terminal $t_i \in T$, $y^i(t_i) = 1$ and $y^j(t_i) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$;
- for each vertex $b_{\{ij\}} \in V_b$, $y^i(b_{\{ij\}}) = y^j(b_{\{ij\}}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $y^\ell(b_{\{ij\}}) = 0$ for all $\ell \neq i, j$;
- for each terminal $t_i \in T$, we set $x^i(t_i) = y^i(t_i) - y^i(b_{\{ij\}}) = \frac{1}{2}$, $x^j(t_i) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, and $x(t_i) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} x^\ell(t_i) = \frac{1}{2}$;
- for each vertex $b_{\{ij\}} \in V_b$, we set $x^i(b_{\{ij\}}) = y^i(b_{\{ij\}}) - y^i(t_j) = \frac{1}{2}$, $x^j(b_{\{ij\}}) = y^j(b_{\{ij\}}) - y^j(t_i) = \frac{1}{2}$, $x^\ell(b_{\{ij\}}) = 0$ for all $\ell \neq i, j$, and $x(b_{\{ij\}}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} x^\ell(b_{\{ij\}}) = 1$.

Let OPT(LP-MUHV) denote the optimum of the instance I in the LP relaxation (LP-MUHV). It is no greater than the value of the above fractional feasible solution, that is,

$$\text{OPT(LP-MUHV)} \leq \frac{1}{2} k w_t + \binom{k}{2} w_b. \tag{26}$$

Combining Eqs. (25) and (26) and setting $w_b = 0$, it gives a lower bound on the integrality gap of (LP-MUHV):

$$\frac{\text{OPT(MUHV)}}{\text{OPT(LP-MUHV)}} \geq \frac{k-1}{\frac{1}{2}k} = 2 - \frac{2}{k}.$$

We thus have proved the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 11.** *The integrality gap of (*LP-MUHV*) has a lower bound of* $2 - \frac{2}{k}$.

Theorems 9 and 11 together imply that the $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation algorithm RR for the MUHV problem is the best possible based on the LP relaxation (LP-MUHV), and furthermore

▶ **Corollary 12.** *The* $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$*-approximation algorithm* RR *for the Sub-ML problem is the best possible based on the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension (*CP-Sub-ML*).*

In the *hypergraph multiway cut* (Hyp-MC) problem, we are given a hypergraph $H = (V_H, E_H)$ with a non-negative weight $w(e)$ for each hyperedge $e \in E_H$ and a set of k terminals $T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k\} \subseteq V$. The goal is to remove a minimum-weight set of hyperedges so that every two terminals are disconnected. Ene *et al.* [7] proved that a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for Hyp-MC is NP-hard, for any $\epsilon > 0$, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture. We show next that it is also Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for the MUHV problem.

▶ **Theorem 13.** *No $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for the MUHV problem exists, for any $\epsilon > 0$, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by constructing an approximation preserving reduction from the Hyp-MC problem to the MUHV problem.

Given an instance $(H = (V_H, E_H), w(\cdot), T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k\})$ of the Hyp-MC problem, we construct an instance $(G = (V, E), w'(\cdot), C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}, c)$ of MUHV as follows:

- for each hyperedge $e \in E_H$, we create a vertex v_e; let the vertex set be $V = V_H \cup V_E$, where $V_E = \{v_e \mid e \in E_H\}$; call $T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k\} \subseteq V$ the terminal set;
- for each vertex $v \in V_H$, its weight is $w'(v) = 0$; for each vertex $v_e \in V_E$, its weight is $w'(v_e) = w(e)$;
- for each vertex $v_e \in V_E$, it is adjacent to every vertex of e; let the edge set be $E = \{\{v_e, v\} \mid e \in E_H, v \in e\}$;
- let the color set be $C = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and let the partial coloring function $c : V \mapsto C$ pre-color the terminal t_i with i.

We note that the graph G is actually bipartite, and the two parts of vertices are V_H and V_E.

Consider a simple path P connecting two terminals t_i and t_j in the hypergraph $H = (V_H, E_H)$. Every two consecutive vertices on P must belong to a common hyperedge; therefore, the path P one-to-one corresponds to a simple path in the constructed graph $G = (V, E)$ connecting the two vertices t_i and t_j, which is also denoted as P without any ambiguity. For any coloring function c^* that completes the given partial coloring function c, we have $c^*(t_i) = i$ for each $i = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. It follows that any simple path P connecting t_i and t_j must contain at least one vertex $v_e \in V_E$ such that its preceding vertex and its succeeding vertex, both in V_H, are colored differently. The vertex v_e is thus unhappy under the coloring scheme c^*. In the hypergraph H, removing the corresponding hyperedge e breaks the path P, thus disconnecting t_i and t_j via the path P. Therefore, removing all the hyperedges whose corresponding vertices in the graph G are unhappy disconnects all pairs of terminals. In other words, any solution to the constructed instance of the MUHV problem can be transferred into a feasible solution to the given instance of the Hyp-MC problem; the transfer is done in linear time and the two solutions have exactly the same value.

Conversely, given a subset E_H^* of hyperedges in the hypergraph $H = (V_H, E_H)$ whose removal disconnects all pairs of terminals, let V_H^i and E_H^i denote the subsets of vertices and hyperedges in the connected component of the remainder hypergraph $(V_H, E_H - E_H^*)$ that contains the terminal t_i, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Denote the vertex subsets in the constructed graph $G = (V, E)$ corresponding to V_H^i and E_H^i as V_H^i and V_E^i, respectively, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. We complete the partial coloring function c by coloring all vertices of $V_H^i \cup V_E^i$ with the color i, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, and coloring all the other remaining vertices of V with the color 1. Clearly, all vertices of $\{v_e \mid e \in E_H - E_H^*\}$ are happy; due to every vertex of V_H has weight 0 (such that we may ignore its happiness), we conclude that the total weight of unhappy vertices in this coloring scheme is no more than $w(E_H^*) := \sum_{e \in E_H^*} w(e)$.

In summary, the Hyp-MC problem is polynomial-time reducible to the MUHV problem, and our reduction preserves the value of any feasible solution and consequently preserves the approximation ratio. ◀

▶ **Corollary 14.** *No* $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$*-approximation algorithm for the Sub-ML problem exists, for any* $\epsilon > 0$*, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture.*

5 Conclusions

We studied the maximum happy vertices (MHV) problem and its complement, the minimum unhappy vertices (MUHV) problem. We first showed that the MHV and MUHV problems are a special case of the supermodular and submodular multi-labeling (Sup-ML and Sub-ML) problems, respectively, by re-writing the objective functions as set functions. We next showed that the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension, presented by Chekuri and Ene for the submodular multi-partitioning (Sub-MP) problem [3], can be extended for the Sub-ML problem, thereby proving that the Sub-ML (Sup-ML, respectively) can be approximated within a factor of $2 - \frac{2}{k}$ ($\frac{2}{k}$, respectively). These general results imply that the MHV and the MUHV problems can also be approximated within $\frac{2}{k}$ and $2 - \frac{2}{k}$, respectively, using the same approximation algorithms.

For MHV, this $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm improves the previous best approximation ratio $\max\{\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{\Delta+1}\}$ [24, 23], where Δ is the maximum vertex degree of the input graph. We also showed that the LP relaxation presented by Zhang *et al.* [23] is the same as the concave relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sup-ML problem; we then proved an upper bound of $\frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of the LP relaxation. These suggest that the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm is the best possible based on the LP relaxation; thus the $\frac{2}{k}$-approximation algorithm is also the best possible based on the concave relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sup-ML problem.

For MUHV, we formulated a novel LP relaxation and proved that it is the same as the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem; we then showed a lower bound of $2 - \frac{2}{k}$ on the integrality gap of the LP relaxation. Similarly, these suggest that the $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation algorithm is the best possible based on the LP relaxation; thus the $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation algorithm is also the best possible based on the convex relaxation on the Lovász extension for the Sub-ML problem. Lastly, we proved that this $(2 - \frac{2}{k})$-approximation is optimal for the MUHV problem, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture. The last hardness result gives another evidence that it is Unique Games-hard to achieve a $(2 - \frac{2}{k} - \epsilon)$-approximation for the general Sub-ML problem, for any $\epsilon > 0$.

References

1. N. Buchbinder, J. S. Naor, and R. Schwartz. Simplex partitioning via exponential clocks and the multiway cut problem. In *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 535–544, 2013.
2. G. Călinescu, H. Karloff, and Y. Rabani. An improved approximation algorithm for multiway cut. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 48–52, 1998.
3. C. Chekuri and A. Ene. Approximation algorithms for submodular multiway partition. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 807–816, 2011.
4. C. Chekuri and A. Ene. Submodular cost allocation problem and applications. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 354–366, 2011.

5 E. Dahlhaus, D. S. Johnson, C. H. Papadimitriou, P. D. Seymour, and M. Yannakakis. The complexity of multiterminal cuts. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 23:864–894, 1994.

6 S. Dobzinski and M. Schapira. An improved approximation algorithm for combinatorial auctions with submodular bidders. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm*, pages 1064–1073, 2006.

7 A. Ene, J. Vondrák, and Y. Wu. Local distribution and the symmetry gap: Approximability of multiway partitioning problems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 306–325, 2013.

8 U. Feige. On maximizing welfare when utility functions are subadditive. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39:122–142, 2009.

9 U. Feige and J. Vondrak. The allocation problem with submodular utility functions. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2006.

10 A. Freund and H. Karloff. A lower bound of $8/(7 + \frac{1}{k-1})$ on the integrality ratio of the Călinescu-Karloff-Rabani relaxation for multiway cut. *Information Processing Letters*, 75:43–50, 2000.

11 N. Garg, V. V. Vazirani, and M. Yannakakis. Multiway cuts in node weighted graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 50:49–61, 2004.

12 F. Harary. *Graph Theory*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1969.

13 D. R. Karger, P. Klein, C. Stein, M. Thorup, and N. E. Young. Rounding algorithms for a geometric embedding of minimum multiway cut. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 29:436–461, 2004.

14 S. Khot, R. J. Lipton, E. Markakis, and A. Mehta. Inapproximability results for combinatorial auctions with submodular utility functions. *Algorithmica*, 52:3–18, 2008.

15 M. Langberg, Y. Rabani, and C. Swamy. Approximation algorithms for graph homomorphism problems. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 176–187. 2006.

16 B. Lehmann, D. Lehmann, and N. Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 18–28, 2001.

17 D. Lehmann, L. I. Oćallaghan, and Y. Shoham. Truth revelation in approximately efficient combinatorial auctions. *Journal of the ACM*, 49:577–602, 2002.

18 L. Lovász. Submodular functions and convexity. In *Mathematical Programming The State of the Art*, pages 235–257. 1983.

19 K. Okumoto, T. Fukunaga, and H. Nagamochi. Divide-and-conquer algorithms for partitioning hypergraphs and submodular systems. *Algorithmica*, 62:787–806, 2012.

20 A. Sharma and J. Vondrák. Multiway cut, pairwise realizable distributions, and descending thresholds. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 724–733, 2014.

21 A. Shioura and S. Suzuki. Optimal allocation problem with quadratic utility functions and its relationship with graph cut problem. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 55:92–105, 2012.

22 J. Vondrák. Symmetry and approximability of submodular maximization problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42:265–304, 2013.

23 P. Zhang, T. Jiang, and A. Li. Improved approximation algorithms for the maximum happy vertices and edges problems. In *Computing and Combinatorics*, pages 159–170. 2015.

24 P. Zhang and A. Li. Algorithmic aspects of homophyly of networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 593:117–131, 2015.

25 L. Zhao, H. Nagamochi, and T. Ibaraki. Greedy splitting algorithms for approximating multiway partition problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 102:167–183, 2005.

A Properties of the boundary $\partial(\cdot)$

▶ **Lemma 15.** *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the boundary $\partial : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ has the following properties: i) $\partial(\emptyset) = \emptyset$; ii) $\partial(X \cap Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$; iii) $\partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$; and iv) $\partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)$, for any two subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$.*

Proof. Recall that for any $X \subseteq V$, $\partial(X)$ is the subset of vertices of X each has at least one neighbor outside of X. It follows that $\partial(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Next, for any $v \in \partial(X \cap Y)$, $v \in X \cap Y$ and v has a neighbor $u \notin X \cap Y$. That is, u is either outside of X or outside of Y. If u is outside of X, then $v \in \partial(X)$; otherwise, $v \in \partial(Y)$. Therefore, $\partial(X \cap Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$.

For any $v \in \partial(X \cup Y)$, $v \in X \cup Y$ and v has a neighbor $u \notin X \cup Y$. If $v \in X$, then $v \in \partial(X)$; otherwise, $v \in \partial(Y)$. Therefore, $\partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$.

Lastly, from the last paragraph, if $v \in \partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y)$, then $v \in X \cap Y$ and v has a neighbor $u \notin X \cup Y$. These imply that $v \in \partial(X)$ and $v \in \partial(Y)$, i.e., $v \in \partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)$. Therefore, $\partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)$. ◀

B Submodularity of the set function $f(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (1)

Proof. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we want to prove that for any two subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$, $f(X) + f(Y) \geq f(X \cap Y) + f(X \cup Y)$, where $f(X) := w(\partial(X))$.

Recall that the boundary $\partial : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfies ii) $\partial(X \cap Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$ and iii) $\partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$. Therefore, $\partial(X \cap Y) \cup \partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)$ also holds. Furthermore, the boundary $\partial : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ also satisfies iv) $\partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y) \subseteq \partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)$. We thus conclude that

$$w(\partial(X \cap Y) \cup \partial(X \cup Y)) + w(\partial(X \cap Y) \cap \partial(X \cup Y)) \leq w(\partial(X) \cup \partial(Y)) + w(\partial(X) \cap \partial(Y)),$$

which is exactly

$$f(X \cap Y) + f(X \cup Y)) \leq f(X) + f(Y).$$

This proves the submodularity (Lemma 8, and the supermodularity in Lemma 3). ◀

C An instance showing that Sub-ML does not reduce to Sub-MP

The following instance of the MUHV problem shows that, given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and some pre-colored vertices, contracting the vertices pre-colored the same into a single vertex will change the objective function, resulting in an instance with a completely different optimum.

We set a constant $W > \epsilon > 0$.

In this instance I, the input graph $G = (V, E)$ has 9 vertices, each vertex v_i has a non-negative weight $w(v_i)$, the color set is $C = \{1, 2, 3\}$, and the partial coloring function c pre-colors 2 vertices with each color. In more details,

$V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_9\}$;
$E = \{(v_i, v_{i+1}), (v_i, v_{i+2}), (v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}) | i = 1, 4, 7\} \cup \{(v_2, v_6), (v_5, v_9), (v_8, v_3)\}$;
$w(v_1) = w(v_4) = w(v_7) = W > 0$,
$w(v_i) = \epsilon < W,\ i = 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9$;
$c(v_1) = c(v_2) = 1$,
$c(v_4) = c(v_5) = 2$,
$c(v_7) = c(v_8) = 3$.

Since v_3, v_6, v_9 must be unhappy and $W > \epsilon$, an optimal solution is to color v_3 with 1, v_6 with 2 and v_9 with 3. Then the minimum total weight of unhappy vertices is 6ϵ. Observe that in this optimal solution, v_1 is happy but v_2 is not.

By contracting all the vertices pre-colored with the same color into a single vertex, that is, contracting v_1, v_2 into v_{12}, contracting v_4, v_5 into v_{45}, and contracting v_7, v_8 into v_{78}, we obtain an instance $I' = (G' = (V', E'), w', C, c')$ as follows:

$V' = \{v_{12}, v_3, v_{45}, v_6, v_{78}, v_9\}$;
$E' = \{(v_{12}, v_3), (v_{45}, v_6), (v_{78}, v_9)\} \cup \{(v_{12}, v_6), (v_{45}, v_9), (v_{78}, v_3)\}$;
$w'(v_{12}) = w'(v_{45}) = w'(v_{78}) = W + \epsilon$,
$w'(v_3) = w'(v_6) = w'(v_9) = \epsilon$;
$c'(v_{12}) = 1$,
$c'(v_{45}) = 2$,
$c'(v_{78}) = 3$.

Note that G' is a simple circle. Since v_3, v_6, v_9 must still be unhappy, at most one of v_{12}, v_{45} and v_{78} can become happy. Thus the minimum total weight of unhappy vertices here is $2W + 5\epsilon > 6\epsilon$. This optimal coloring scheme for I' is certainly not optimal for I.

We remark that such a contracting procedure fails for one reason that the vertices pre-colored the same do not have the same neighbors. For example, v_1 has a neighbor v_3 other than v_2 while v_2 has neighbors v_3 and v_6 other than v_1.